

REMARKS

When the above referenced office action was mailed, claims 1-24, 26, and 27 were pending in the application.

Claims 1-9 are allowed.

Claims 10-14, 17, 20-24, and 27 were rejected.

Claims 15, 16, 18, 19, and 26 were objected to.

Claims 18 and 26 have been canceled.

Claims 10, 15, and 21 are amended.

Claims 28-38 have been added.

No new matter has been entered.

Claims 1-17, 19-24, and 27-38 remain in the application.

Claim Objection

Claim 15 is objected to as needing to clarify the recitation of an element of the claim. Although the Applicant does not concede that claim 15 lacked clarity, in an attempt to expedite prosecution claim 15 has been amended to recite that the resilient elements are disposed parallel with respect to one another such that at least one of the plurality of resilient elements comprises a length greater than the other resilient elements. The Applicant submits that this amendment overcomes the objection to further prosecution.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

Claims 21-23 and 27 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Short.

The Applicant does not concede that claim 21 was anticipated by Short; however, in an attempt to expedite prosecution, claim 21 has been amended to include the elements of claim 26, which was indicated as having allowable subject matter. Thus, the Applicant submits that claim 21 is in proper form for allowance. The Applicant notes that claim 21 was also amended to specify that at least a portion of the plurality of resilient elements are adjacent to at least a portion of the transparent window, rather than necessarily abutting them. New dependent claim 38 specifies that the portion of the plurality of resilient elements being adjacent to at least a portion of the transparent window includes the portion of the plurality of resilient elements abutting at least a portion of the transparent window. The Applicant submits that this distinction does not alter the allowability of claim 21.

Claims 22-23 and 27 depend from claim 21. Based at least in part on this dependency, the Applicant submits that claims 22-23 and 27 are likewise in proper form for allowance.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Claims 10-12, 14, 17, and 20 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,687,027 to Short et al. (“Short”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,652,665 to Chen et al. (“Chen”).

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Short in view of Chen as applied to claims 10 and 12, and further in view of well known art.

Claim 24 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Short in view of well known art.

The Applicant does not concede that claim 10 was unpatentable over Short in view of Chen; however, in an attempt to expedite prosecution, claim 10 has been amended to include the elements of claim 18, which was indicated as having allowable subject matter. Thus, the Applicant submits that claim 10 is in proper form for allowance. The Applicant notes that claim 10 was also amended to specify that at least a portion of the plurality of resilient elements are adjacent to at least a portion of the transparent window, rather than necessarily abutting them. New dependent claim 37 specifies that the portion of the plurality of resilient elements being adjacent to at least a portion of the transparent window includes the portion of the plurality of resilient elements abutting at least a portion of the transparent window. The Applicant submits that this distinction does not alter the allowability of claim 10.

Claims 11-14, 17, and 20 depend from claim 10. Based at least in part on this dependency, the Applicant submits that claims 11-14, 17, and 20 are likewise in proper form for allowance.

Claim 24 depends from claim 21. Based at least in part on this dependency, the Applicant submits that claim 24 is likewise in proper form for allowance.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-9 are allowed. Claims 15, 16, 18, 19, and 26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the patentable subject matter of these claims. As discussed above, the elements of claims 18 and 26 were respectively

included in their underlying base claims 10 and 21 to place these claims in proper form for allowance.

New Claims

Claims 28-38 have been added to the application. Claim 28 includes the elements of claim 10 and claim 19. As claim 19 was indicated as including allowable subject matter, the Applicant submits that claim 28 is in proper form for allowance. Claims 29-33 depend from claim 28 and include elements similar to those of the claims that depend from claim 10. Claim 34 includes similar limitations to claim 1, which has been indicated as including allowable subject matter, but has been written in means plus function form. The Applicant submits that claim 34 (and claims 35-36, which depend on claim 34) are thus in proper form for allowance as well. Claims 37 and 38 respectively depend from claims 10 and 21.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-17, 19-24, and 27-38 of the application as amended is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Gregg Palmer
Reg. No. 55,520

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613

Customer No. 20575